UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,626	03/17/2006	Velliyu Nott Mallikarjuna Rao	CL2320 US PCT	7661
David E Heise	7590 02/23/200 r	EXAMINER		
E I Du Pont De Nemours and Company Legal Patent Records Center 4417 Lancaster pike Wilmington, DE 19805			PARSA, JAFAR F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	
Page 1				
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/572,626	RAO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jafar Parsa	1621			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 M	farch 2006	•			
· <u>·</u>	<u>-</u>				
closed in accordance with the practice under E					
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected to by the I	Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ed in this National Stage			
application from the International Bureau	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/16/2006.	6) Other:	atont i ppiloditori			

Application/Control Number: 10/572,626

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/572,625 and claims 1-7 of copending application No. 10/572,627. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the references teach the use of structurally similar compound for manufacturing of hydrofluorocarbons. Nothing unobvious is seen in substituting hydrogen for fluorine atoms or vice versa. The claimed process would have been

Application/Control Number: 10/572,626

Art Unit: 1621

Page 3

obvious to the skilled artisan because the process for preparing the close structural

similarity of the reference compounds suggests the process for preparing the instant

compounds.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the

conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jafar Parsa whose telephone number is (571)272-0643.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m.-4:30 p.m. (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jäfar Parsa

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1621

J. PARSA

PRIMARY EXAMINER

JP February 20, 2007